

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640
Final Office Action dated: December 22, 2004
Response dated: April 21, 2005

Page 10 of 13

REMARKS

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's efforts to date and hereby responds fully to the outstanding office action.

Objection of Oath/Declaration

The Examiner has pointed out that the declaration papers on file with the USPTO do not show the post office address of inventor no. 3 (K. Forbes). It would appear that a poor photocopy of the declaration resulted in the post office address being cut off from the copy on file. Accordingly, the undersigned is in the process of obtaining the original signature document from previous counsel. If such efforts fail, a supplemental declaration by inventor no. 3 (K. Forbes) will be sought upon indication of allowance.

Objection to Claim 43

The Examiner has objected to informalities in the claim language where proper antecedent language was not followed. Corrections have been made accordingly and the Examiner is thanked for bringing this to Applicants' attention.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 29-34 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 29-34 as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. Patent 5,623,652) in view of Cahill Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,428,784). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants have amended each independent claim in such a manner so as to more clearly present the scope of patent protection sought. Specifically, an important aspect of the present invention described is to avoid the need to manually update information gathered about a person or company listed within one's electronic calendar. See Applicants' original Background section at page 2, lines 8-21. More generally, embodiments of the invention

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640
Final Office Action dated: December 22, 2004
Response dated: April 21, 2005

Page 11 of 13

provide for updating search information related to a person or other entity, or object, in a calendar entry (p. 3, line 3-4 and 21-23).

The present invention overcomes this problem by automatically generating a search request, e.g. about a person or company listed within one's electronic calendar and updating the result of the search request in a pre-scheduled manner. Updating with regard to the search result is accomplished by modifying a file of the electronic calendar of the user. In this way, the user can access the electronic calendar at any time and receive current information updates about a person or company listed within their electronic calendar.

In contrast to Applicants' invention, the invention of Vora et al. pertains to deferred search requests and caching of lists of available resources for later retrieval. See Vora et al. at col. 8, line 3 and col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 3. The invention of Vora et al. makes no mention or suggestion to modify an electronic calendar's files with regard to the results of the search request. Moreover, there is no showing or suggestion whatsoever to pre-schedule any updating of an electronic calendar's files.

In Cahill Jr., that invention pertains to relatively narrow aspect of dynamic responses to an electronic message from an electronic calendar. Specifically, one's electronic calendar is updated via a network in regard to information about the event itself – i.e., user availability, time and place of meeting, ...etc. See col. 3, lines 14-32 of Cahill, Jr. As mentioned above, Applicants' instant invention is related to automatically generating a search request about a person or company listed within one's electronic calendar and updating the result of the search request in a pre-scheduled manner. Cahill Jr. is only concerned with calendar-centric information – i.e., information regarding the event itself. The present invention updates the electronic calendar with regard to the search result and does so by modifying a file of the electronic calendar of the user in regard to the search result. This is not found or suggested within Cahill Jr.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the combination of Vora et al. with Cahill Jr. does not result in anything that would resemble the present invention. Moreover, Applicants do not find any proper motivation whatsoever in either of these references that would suggest

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640
Final Office Action dated: December 22, 2004
Response dated: April 21, 2005

Page 12 of 13

combining them. The Examiner's rationale was stated to be that "[o]ne would have been motivated to use a calendar file [as in Cahill Jr.] in Vora because Vora is concerned with improving searching for information in a local and internet network". Quite respectfully, Applicants fail to see the logic of such motivation. Specifically, Cahill Jr. involves the exchange of calendar scheduling information over a network and does not involve any search results related to any calendar object (i.e., a person or company listed within the electronic calendar). Accordingly, no proper motivation to combine appears to exist. Further, any combination of the two references fails to result in the present claimed invention.

Applicants further submit that each independent claim has now been amended to make it readily apparent that the claimed invention modifies the file of the electronic calendar with regard to the search result. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 29-34, and by dependence also each claim dependent therefrom, each now contain clear features not shown or fairly suggested by the cited art. Applicants therefore respectfully submit these claimed features are not disclosed by Vora et al. nor are they obvious in view of any of the cited art in any combination with Cahill Jr. or the other cited art. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 29-34 are allowable over this combination of references.

Rejection of Claims 23-28 and 35-44 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 23-28 and 35-44 as being unpatentable over Vora et al., Cahill Jr., and further in view of Stark (U.S. Patent 5,935,210). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants herein incorporate the arguments made above in regard to the inapplicability of Vora et al. and Cahill Jr. taken alone or in combination with each other. As Claims 23-28 and 35-44 properly depend from claims argued above, they are also respectfully submitted to be patentable over Vora et al. and Cahill Jr. with further reference to Stark. Specifically, nothing in Stark is believed to overcome the deficiencies with the Vora et al. and Cahill Jr. combination. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 23-28 and 35-44 are allowable over this combination of references.

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640
Final Office Action dated: December 22, 2004
Response dated: April 21, 2005

Page 13 of 13


Conclusion

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to debit any required fee from Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. The Commissioner is further authorized to debit any additional amount required, and to credit any overpayment to the above-noted deposit account.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Ann MAHAN et al.



By: _____

Dennis R. Haszko
Reg. No. 39,575
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9
CANADA
Tel: (613) 237-5160
Fax: (613) 787-3558
E-mail: dhaszko@blgcanada.com

DRH/sum